

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1-41 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 15, 16, 25, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Mohri (US Publication 2002/0012014). Claims 3-6 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mohri in view of Rafii et al. (US Patent 6,512,838).

By this Amendment, Applicants hereby amend claims 1 and 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 15, 16, 25, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Mohri (US Publication 2002/0012014).

The Examiner has provided the same basic rejection of independent claims 1 and 15 in the instant Office Action as was provided in the previous Office Action, dated December 30, 2009. Therefore, the following comments are mainly directed toward the Examiner's comments in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, on pages 6 and 7 of the instant Office Action.

In the Amendment filed March 31, 2010, Applicants argued that the control command disclosed in Mohri and identified by the Examiner is not a configuration of the 3D input device, but is a function of a configuration of the 3D input device. In the Response to Arguments Section of the Office Action, on pages 6 and 7, the Examiner argues that "the control command of the 3D input device is a specific type of configuration" and that "a command based

configuration could read on(sic) claimed invention ‘configuration’” The Examiner further indicates that that Applicant’s argument that Mohri maintains the same configuration regardless of the hand shape, while in the instant application, an identical hand shape will result in different control commands depending on the configuration, is unpersuasive, since the argued feature is not recited in the claims.

Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner’s rejection, Applicants hereby amend claim 1 to recite “wherein the adaptively configuring the 3D input device comprises determining the number of fingers on which the plurality of devices are worn and assigning a configuration to the input device based on the number of fingers which are wearing a finger device” and “wherein the input operation is determined by a combination of the finger positions and the assigned configuration of the input device, such that identical finger positions will produce different input operations depending on the assigned configuration of the input device”. Applicants respectfully submit that Mohri does not anticipate amended claim 1.

As amended, claim 1 requires that an input operation be determined based on both the recognized finger positions and the configuration of the input device. In other words, the positioning of the finger positions alone is insufficient to establish the desired input operation. On the other hand, Mohri discloses that a control command in Mohri is identified only by recognizing a particular hand shape. As noted in paragraph [0032] of Mohri, the posture sensor outputs a posture of the hand, and a command generator generates a command based on the output of the posture sensor. However, the control command identified by recognizing a

particular hand shape is not dependent on both finger positioning and the assigned configuration, such that identical finger positions will produce different input operations depending on the assigned configuration of the input device. As noted in the Amendment filed March 20, 2010, the Examiner has yet to identify a single embodiment of Mohri which indicates that an identical hand position results in two different commands being produced, based on the configuration corresponding to the recognized finger positions of the finger devices. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Mohri fails to disclose each of the elements of amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the applied art. Claim 15 is hereby amended to recite features similar to amended claim 1, and is patentable for reasons analogous to amended claim 1. Claims 2, 16, 25 40 and 41 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-6 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mohri in view of Rafii et al. (US Patent 6,512,838).

Claims 3-6 and 17-18 are dependent from claims 1 and 15. Because Mohri fails to disclose each of the elements of claims 1 and 15, and because Rafii fails to cure the deficiencies noted with respect to claims 1 and 15, claims 3-6 and 17-18 should be patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dion R. Ferguson/

Dion R. Ferguson
Registration No. 59,561

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 4, 2010